

**Remark**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended. Claim 4 has been amended to correct a dependency. No claims have been canceled. Therefore, claims 1-20 are now presented for examination.

**35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections***Mathews*

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-7 and 9-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) as being anticipated by Mathews III, U.S. Patent No. 5,815,145 ("Mathews"). The Examiner appears to recognize that in Mathews each tile of Figure 4 has the information banner 106 and that Mathews offers two functions for the Figure 4 display. When focused on, a tile goes from still image to video and when selected the selected video fills the screen.

Applicants have suggested that Claim 1 is different from Mathews and, for Claim 1, the disagreement would seem to focus on the last element "displaying entertainment system data regarding the entertainment selection corresponding to the respective window upon selection by a user of the respective window."

The Examiner would appear to be reading "displaying entertainment system data" on the process in Mathews of tuning to the corresponding source and rendering the video. Applicants respectfully submit that this reading of Claim 1 is inconsistent with the claim and with the specification. First, the video data is already being displayed as recited in the first two elements of the claim. According to the Examiner's reading then, the third element has no meaning as there is no change caused by the selection.

Second, this reading of Claim 1 is inconsistent with Claim 8 in which a full-screen display of the video is an additional operation and therefore not the same as the third element of Claim 1.

Third, the specification in paragraphs 28, 29, and 30 characterize entertainment system data in the context of the present application and, consistent with the usage of the claims, it is different from the video for the corresponding entertainment selection.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 1 is traversed. Claims 11 and 17 are worded similarly and are believed allowable on similar grounds. The remaining claims are dependent and believed also to be allowable on these grounds, *inter alia*.

Even if the Examiner cannot find the claims allowable on the grounds provided above, Applicants respectfully request that some of the dependent claims be reconsidered. Some of the dependent claims are discussed below.

Claims 5 and 14 relate to showing a description or a critique when a particular window is selected. Mathews does not disclose such a function when a tile is selected. The Examiner suggests that the selection itself is a description of the selection, however, such a reading renders the word "description" meaningless. Accordingly, these claims are not anticipated.

Claims 10, 15, and 20 relate to traits of the entertainment selections. The Examiner suggests that this reads on Mathews grouping of most frequently accessed channels. Applicants respectfully submit that a channel is not an entertainment selection but a source of an entertainment selections. Accordingly, these claims are not anticipated.

**35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection,***Mathews in view of Broadwin*

The Examiner has rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over ("Mathews"), in view of Broadwin, U.S. Patent No. 5,903,816 ("Broadwin"). Broadwin fails to overcome any of the shortcomings of Mathews discussed above.

**Conclusion**

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome by the amendment and remark, and that the claims as amended are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn and the claims as amended be allowed.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

**Invitation for a Telephone Interview**

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

**Request for an Extension of Time**

Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.


**Charge our Deposit Account**

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: March 6, 2006

  
Gordon R. Lindeen III  
Reg. No. 33,192

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030  
(303) 740-1980

Docket No. 42390P6487C  
Express Mail No. EL807366780US

11

BEST AVAILABLE COPY